



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,104	08/10/2001	Francisco O'Meany	WCTI2001	3891
7590	10/04/2005		EXAMINER CHANG, ERIC	
H: Michael Brucker Suite 110 5855 Doyle Street Emeryville, CA 94608			ART UNIT 2116	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,104

Applicant(s)

O'MEANY, FRANCISCO

Examiner

Eric Chang

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-16 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,633,823 to Bartone et al.
4. As to claim 1, Bartone discloses a wireless remote control system for controlling power distribution from a power source to a computer the combination comprising: a master controller computer (22) for generating power distribution signals [col. 6, lines 45-48]; a wireless signal receiver (36) for receiving power distribution signals [col. 5, lines 29-67]; a wireless signal transmission link (46) delivering power distribution signals from said master controller to said wireless signal receiver [col. 6, lines 3-10]; an external power switch disposed between the power source and the computer and having an open condition in which the power source is disconnected from the computer and a closed condition in which the power source is connected to the computer [col. 5, lines 59-67]; an intelligent agent (30) that receives signals from said wireless signal receiver [FIG. 3], distributes control signals to and receives signals from the computer to be controlled and controls the condition of said power switch [col. 5, lines 11-45]; a two-way communication link (32) between the computer to be controlled and said intelligent

Art Unit: 2116

agent over which signals between said intelligent agent and the computer to be controlled are transmitted [col. 5, lines 11-28].

5. As to claim 2, Bartone discloses a database of information about the controlled computer and used by said master controller computer to generate a computer shutdown control signal that is recognized by the controlled computer [col. 6, lines 11-18].

6. As to claim 7, Bartone discloses said two-way communication link is a wireless link [col. 5, lines 40-45].

7. As to claim 8, Bartone discloses a wireless remote control system for controlling power distribution to a plurality of computers, the combination comprising: a master controller computer for generating power distribution signals [col. 6, lines 11-18]; a wireless signal receiver for receiving power distribution signals [col. 5, lines 29-67]; a wireless signal transmission link delivering power distribution signals from said master controller to said wireless signal receiver [col. 6, lines 3-10]; an intelligent agent (30) that receives signals from said wireless signal receiver [FIG. 3], said intelligent agent having a plurality of two-way communication links, one between said intelligent agent and each of the plurality of computers, wherein said intelligent agent can distribute control signals to and receives signals from each of the plurality of computers and controls the power condition of said computers [col. 5, lines 11-45]. Because Bartone teaches the control signals from the intelligent agent activate and deactivate a computer [col. 5, lines 59-65], Bartone teaches turning off the computer, such as

Art Unit: 2116

disconnecting said computer from its power supply by means of opening a switch, substantially as claimed. Furthermore, Bartone teaches that the control signals allow the central controller computer to directly control the plurality of computers [col. 3, lines 62-67], and that each one of said plurality of computers may be controlled individually [col. 4, lines 18-21]. Thus Bartone teaches that the control signals are directed towards an individual computer, and inherently comprises a unique addressing means for the control signal to be sent to the particular computer, substantially as claimed.

8. As to claim 9, Bartone discloses said two-way communication link is a wireless link [col. 5, lines 40-45].

9. As to claim 10, Bartone discloses a database of information about the controlled computer and used by said master controller computer to generate a computer shutdown control signal that is recognized by the controlled computer [col. 6, lines 11-18].

10. As to claims 15 and 16, Bartone discloses the intelligent agents receive wireless signals to manage activating, deactivating, or limiting the power to the controlled computers [col. 10, lines 22-31]. Furthermore, because Bartone teaches the control signals from the intelligent agent activate and deactivate a computer [col. 5, lines 59-65], Bartone teaches turning off the computer, such as disconnecting said computer from its power supply by means of opening a switch, wherever the switch may be disposed, substantially as claimed.

Art Unit: 2116

11. As to claim 25, Bartone discloses a wireless remote control system for controlling power distribution to a plurality of computers, the combination comprising: a master controller computer for generating power distribution signals [col. 6, lines 11-18]; a wireless signal receiver for receiving power distribution signals [col. 5, lines 29-67]; a wireless signal transmission link delivering power distribution signals from said master controller to said wireless signal receiver [col. 6, lines 3-10]; an intelligent agent that receives signals from said wireless signal receiver and distributes them to the computer to which they are addressed and to the internal power switch of the computer addressed [FIG. 3, and col. 5, lines 11-45]. Because Bartone teaches the control signals from the intelligent agent activate and deactivate a computer [col. 5, lines 59-65], Bartone teaches turning off the computer, such as disconnecting said computer from its power supply by means of opening a switch, wherever the switch may be disposed, substantially as claimed. Furthermore, Bartone teaches that the control signals allow the central controller computer to directly control the plurality of computers [col. 3, lines 62-67], and that each one of said plurality of computers may be controlled individually [col. 4, lines 18-21]. Thus Bartone teaches that the control signals are directed towards an individual computer, and inherently comprises a unique addressing means for the control signal to be sent to the particular computer, substantially as claimed.

12. As to claim 26, Bartone discloses the signals transmitted to the wireless signal receiver include computer shutdown signals and computer startup signals [col. 10, lines 22-31].

Art Unit: 2116

13. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

14. Claims 3-6, 11-14 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,633,823 to Bartone et al.

15. As to claims 3 and 11, Bartone discloses the controlled computer responds to a to a computer shutdown signal by executing an orderly shutdown routine and then transmits a signal indicating that it is safe to disconnect the power source from the controlled computer, which signal is transmitted to said intelligent agent [col. 10, lines 28-31]. Bartone teaches that the controlled computer may have a power conservation mode, and that the intelligent agent may activate or deactivate this mode as desired, causing the computer to enter such a mode in a safe and orderly fashion. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process of activating or deactivating such a mode would comprise any necessary communication protocols, such as safety indication messages or the like, in order for the power conservation mode to be activated or deactivated, substantially as claimed.

16. As to claims 4 and 12, Bartone discloses the intelligent agents manage activating, deactivating, or limiting the power to the controlled computers [col. 10, lines 22-31]; it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that limiting the power to a computer would comprise disconnecting the power source from the controlled computer, substantially as claimed.

Furthermore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process of having the

intelligent agent managing the power of the controlled computer would comprise any necessary communication protocols, such as safety indication messages or the like, in order for the power conservation mode to be activated or deactivated, substantially as claimed.

17. As to claims 5 and 13, Bartone discloses the controlled computer may have a power conservation mode, and that the intelligent agent may activate or deactivate this mode as desired [col. 10, lines 28-31]. Because ACPI is a power conservation mode, it would be inherent for the control process to comprise any necessary ACPI signals in order for the power conservation mode to be activated or deactivated, substantially as claimed.

18. As to claims 6 and 14, Bartone discloses that the master controller, the intelligent agent and the computers to be controlled are all part of a network [col. 5, lines 48-45, and col. 6, lines 7-10]. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that secure communication technology such as authentication protocols well known in the art be implemented in the network, in order to prevent unauthorized access to the devices within the power control system. Indeed, Bartone teaches the use of secure and authenticated communication technology, such as VPN [col. 5, lines 3-6] or other secure network protocols [col. 7, lines 57-67, and col. 8, lines 1-3], in other aspects of the invention. Thus, Bartone teaches it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use authenticated communications, comprising security information identifying the control signal as an authorized signal wherein said intelligent agent only distributes a control signal to the computer to be controlled if the security information is authentic, substantially as claimed.

19. As to claim 17, Bartone discloses the intelligent agents receive wireless signals to manage activating, deactivating, or limiting the power to the controlled computers [col. 10, lines 22-31]. Furthermore, because Bartone teaches the control signals from the intelligent agent activate and deactivate a computer [col. 5, lines 59-65], Bartone teaches turning off the computer, such as disconnecting said computer from its power supply by means of opening a switch, wherever the switch may be disposed, substantially as claimed.

20. As to claim 18, Bartone discloses a method of wirelessly controlling one or more remote devices to be controlled, including the steps of: providing a database (22) with specific information relating to each device to be controlled [col. 5, lines 48-50]; generating a device control signal using information from the database [col. 6, lines 16-18]; wirelessly transmitting the device control signal to a satellite receiving station [FIG. 3, element 52, and col. 6, lines 45-54]; wirelessly transmitting the device control signal from the satellite receiving station to a control signal transceiver [col. 5, lines 29-45]; distributing the control signal from the transceiver to the device to be controlled [col. 5, lines 17-21]; and generating a signal that controls some aspect of the device to be controlled [col. 5, lines 59-67]. Although Bartone does not specifically teach the device transmitting a signal to the transceiver that it is ready to be controlled, Bartone does teach that intelligent agent can control the power mode of the device [col. 10, lines 22-31]. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process of having the intelligent agent managing the power of the controlled computer would comprise any necessary

Art Unit: 2116

communication protocols, such as readiness indication messages or the like, in order for the power conservation mode to be activated or deactivated, substantially as claimed.

21. As to claim 19, Bartone discloses a method of wirelessly controlling one or more remote devices to be controlled, including the steps of: generating a device control signal [col. 6, lines 11-18]; wirelessly transmitting the device control signal to a satellite receiving station [FIG. 3, element 52, and col. 6, lines 45-54]; wirelessly transmitting the device control signal from the satellite receiving station to a control signal transceiver [col. 5, lines 29-45]; distributing the control signal from the transceiver to the device to be controlled [col. 5, lines 17-21]; and generating a signal that controls some aspect of the device to be controlled [col. 5, lines 59-67]. Although Bartone does not specifically teach the device transmitting a signal to the transceiver that it is ready to be controlled, Bartone does teach that intelligent agent can control the power mode of the device [col. 10, lines 22-31]. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process of having the intelligent agent managing the power of the controlled computer would comprise any necessary communication protocols, such as readiness indication messages or the like, in order for the power conservation mode to be activated or deactivated, substantially as claimed.

22. As to claim 20, Bartone discloses a method of wirelessly controlling power distribution to a plurality of computers each of which is connected to a power source, including the steps of: generating power distribution control signals addressed to one or more of the plurality of computers [col. 6, lines 11-18]; wirelessly transmitting the power distribution control signals to a

Art Unit: 2116

satellite receiving station [FIG. 3, element 52, and col. 6, lines 45-54]; wirelessly transmitting the power distribution control signals from the satellite receiving station to a control signal receiver [FIG. 3, and col. 5, lines 29-45]; distributing control signals from the control signal receiver to an intelligent agent [col. 5, lines 17-21]; transmitting over a two-way communication link a control signal from the intelligent agent to each of the plurality of computers addressed by the signal [col. 5, lines 17-21]; and disconnecting from its power source each computer from which a safe-to-shut-down signal is received by the intelligent agent [col. 5, lines 59-67]. Although Bartone does not specifically teach the device transmitting a signal to the intelligent agent that it is safe to shut down, Bartone does teach that intelligent agent can control the power mode of the device [col. 10, lines 22-31]. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process of having the intelligent agent managing the power of the controlled computer would comprise any necessary communication protocols, such as safety indication messages or the like, in order for the power conservation mode to be activated or deactivated, substantially as claimed.

23. As to claim 21, Bartone discloses the controlled computer may have a power conservation mode, and that the intelligent agent may activate or deactivate this mode as desired [col. 10, lines 28-31]. Because ACPI is a power conservation mode, it would be inherent for the control process to comprise any necessary ACPI signals in order for the power conservation mode to be activated or deactivated, substantially as claimed.

24. As to claim 22, Bartone discloses that the master controller, the intelligent agent and the computers to be controlled are all part of a network [col. 5, lines 48-45, and col. 6, lines 7-10]. It

Art Unit: 2116

would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that secure communication technology such as authentication protocols well known in the art be implemented in the network, in order to prevent unauthorized access to the devices within the power control system. Indeed, Bartone teaches the use of secure and authenticated communication technology, such as VPN [col. 5, lines 3-6] or other secure network protocols [col. 7, lines 57-67, and col. 8, lines 1-3], in other aspects of the invention. Thus, Bartone teaches it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use authenticated communications, comprising security information identifying the control signal as an authorized signal wherein said intelligent agent only distributes a control signal to the computer to be controlled if the security information is authentic, substantially as claimed.

25. As to claims 23-24, Bartone discloses said two-way communication link is a wireless link [col. 5, lines 40-45].

Response to Amendment

26. The affidavit filed on August 26, 2005 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Bartone reference.

27. The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice “amounts essentially to mere

Art Unit: 2116

pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts” and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant.

28. The affidavit or declaration must state FACTS and produce such documentary evidence and exhibits in support thereof as are available to show conception and completion of invention in this country or in a NAFTA or WTO member country (MPEP § 715.07(c)), at least the conception being at a date prior to the effective date of the reference. Where there has not been reduction to practice prior to the date of the reference, the applicant or patent owner must also show diligence in the completion of his or her invention from a time just prior to the date of the reference continuously up to the date of an actual reduction to practice or up to the date of filing his or her application (filing constitutes a constructive reduction to practice, 37 CFR 1.131).

29. As discussed above, 37 CFR 1.131(b) provides three ways in which an applicant can establish prior invention of the claimed subject matter. The showing of facts must be sufficient to show:

- (A) reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference; or
- (B) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to a subsequent (actual) reduction to practice; or
- (C) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of the application (constructive reduction to practice).

30. Applicant has not met the burden of showing conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of the application, as described above.

31. Applicant has not met the burden of showing reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference from prior to the reference date, as described above.

Conception of the Invention

32. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Bartone reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

33. Examiner has reviewed Exhibit A. While Exhibit A has detail about the conception of the invention, Applicant has not established documentation or proof that the conception of the invention resulted in demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. For example, there is not a clear explanation of the conception of an intelligent agent in the exhibit, and there is insufficient evidence that the demonstration of the invention was indeed effected by the claimed intelligent agent.

Reduction to Practice

34. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the July 13, 2000 reference.

35. Examiner has reviewed the affidavit. While Applicant declares that the inventions were reduced to practice before July 13, 2000 by completing a fully operational prototype by June 29, 2000 [declarations 8 and 10]; Applicant has not clearly explained how the prototype supports reduction to practice of the claimed invention. It is not clear from the exhibits which of the claimed limitations are satisfied by the prototype. For example, there is no evidence that the claimed aspect of the prototype being a two-way system was in fact implemented at that time. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the claimed invention.

Statement of Truth

36. An affidavit is a statement in writing made under oath before a notary public, magistrate, or officer authorized to administer oaths. See MPEP § 604 through § 604.06 for additional information regarding formal requirements of affidavits. The declaration must include an acknowledgment by the declarant that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001) and may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon. The declarant must set forth in the body of the declaration that all

Art Unit: 2116

statements made of the declarant's own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true.

37. Examiner has reviewed the affidavit. While Applicant includes an acknowledgement that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both and may jeopardize the validity of the application [declaration 17], Applicant has not included a statement of truth in the affidavit.

38. Examiner has also reviewed the affidavit of Applicant's attorney. While Applicant's attorney includes an acknowledgement that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both and may jeopardize the validity of the application [declaration 7], Applicant's attorney has not included a statement of truth in the affidavit.

Conclusion

39. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3671. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2116

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 28, 2005
ec


LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100